



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/541,636	07/05/2005	John Michael Roll	1025-P03655US00(AAF-02)	4093
110	7590	10/16/2007	EXAMINER	
DANN, DORFMAN; HERRELL & SKILLMAN 1601 MARKET STREET SUITE 2400 PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103-2307			ROST, ANDREW J	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3753		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/16/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/541,636	ROLL ET AL.
	Examiner Andrew J. Rost	Art Unit 3753

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-7, 9-18, 20 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 9 and 22 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-7, 10-18 and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed on 4/25/2007. Claim 9 has been amended. No claims have been added. Claims 8, 19 and 21 have been canceled. Presently, claims 1-7, 9-18, 20 and 22 are pending.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-7, 10-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tychsen (WO 98/15788) in view of Gordon (3,707,987).

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Tychsen discloses a valve assembly having a housing with an inlet (18) and an outlet (19), a piston (23), a valve member (22) that is movable with respect to the piston (see figures 2, 6 and 7) and a biasing means (36). Tychsen does not disclose the use of a manual shut-off means having a spindle and the valve member being biased closed. However, Gordon teaches the use of a spindle having a non-round proximal portion and a threaded distal portion in order to maintain a check valve in a permanently closed position (col. 3, lines 30-35) and the use of a spring (50) to bias a valve member toward a valve seat in order to allow the valve member to function as a check valve (col. 3, lines 12-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

provide the valve assembly of Tychsen with the manual shut-off arrangement and a biased normally closed valve member as taught by Gordon in order to provide an element to lock a check valve into a permanently closed position.

In regards to claims 2, 3 and 15, Tychsen discloses a piston biasing spring (31).

In regards to claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16 and 17, Tychsen discloses the valve member having an inlet surface that contacts a valve seat (20) and the valve member having an opposing face (surface on the opposite side of the valve member from surface 22) and the opposing face having an area substantially equal to the area of the piston (fig. 1).

In regards to claims 6, 7, 12, 13 and 18, Tychsen disclose the valve member having a guiding portion (33) that is received in the piston and the valve is biased by a spring (36).

In regards to claim 20, Gordon teaches the use of a spindle having a non-round proximal portion (74) and a threaded distal portion (68).

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

4. Claims 9 and 22 are allowed.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 4/25/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regards to Applicant's arguments regarding a biasing member that biases the valve member toward a valve seat, Gordon teaches a spring biasing a valve member

toward a valve seat in order to have the valve assembly function as a check valve to be old and well known in the art. Therefore, applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

### ***Conclusion***

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew J. Rost whose telephone number is 571-272-2711. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00 - 4:30 M-Th and 7:00 - 12:00 Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on 571-272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AJR, *AKC 15 October 2007*

  
RAMESH KIRSHNAMURTHY  
PRIMARY EXAMINER